

REMARKS

Claims 6 - 9 are currently being considered, of which claim 7 has been amended. No new claims have been added. Applicant respectfully believes that no new matter has been introduced.

The Examiner has stated that claims 7 - 9 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 7 has been rewritten in independent form in view of the Examiner's suggestion. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that this objection to claims 7 - 9 should be withdrawn.

Before turning to the cited art, a brief review of the present invention is in order.

Fig. 19 is a perspective view of the multi-nozzle head of a third embodiment of the present invention, and Fig. 20 consists of drawings for explaining this head. In Fig. 19, elements the same as ones shown in Fig. 2 are represented by the same reference numerals. In this embodiment, a ground line (low-resistance layer) 23-4 is formed in a position parallel to the row of piezoelectric bodies 27 in the first embodiment. As shown in Fig. 20, the distances (resistance values) rG1 to rGn between the ground line 23-4, which is connected to the ground contact 23-3, and each of the piezoelectric elements 27 are equal (see p. 34, line 12 through p. 35, line 5).

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as anticipated by JP 11-227196 (**Matsuzawa**).

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Matsuzawa fails to describe, teach, or suggest the following features of claim 6: “wherein a low-resistance layer is provided on said common electrode layer in a position parallel to a row of said piezoelectric elements”, in combination with the other claimed features.

Matsuzawa discloses that a thickness of an electrode is made thinner only somewhere in the periphery of the piezoelectric elements. It is performed to solve a problem that the resistance of electrodes becomes higher when the electrodes are made thinner. Using the **Matsuzawa** configuration, increasing of a resistance of electrodes may be prevented. Additionally, some other effects may be achieved. That is, the **Matsuzawa** configuration may prevent a decrease in a response speed, may prevent an increase in heat of electrodes, and may prevent a voltage drop.

However, **Matsuzawa** does not describe, teach or suggest features of the present invention depicted in Figs. 19, 20 such as a structural arrangement wherein a low resistance layer (23-4) is provided on the common electrode layer (23-1) in a position parallel to a row of the piezoelectric elements (27).

The disclosure of **Matsuzawa** relates to an apparatus aimed at preventing an increase in the resistance of an electrode (see paragraph [0006]).

In **Matsuzawa**, it is described that:

- (1) the thickness of the common electrodes is (partially) made thinner only in the periphery (see paragraphs [0007], [0008]); and
- (2) the thickness of the common electrodes and the thickness of the common electrodes other than in the arm part are suitably determined by the skilled person so that when conducting the piezoelectric elements ... the diaphragm bents with enough displacement and the increasing of the resistance of the common electrodes is in the restricted range (see paragraph [0029]).

The disclosure of **Matsuzawa** portrays a negative conception in view of decreasing the resistance of an electrode, and does not provide an adequate amount of information regarding an effective structure or technique. **Matsuzawa** fails to describe, teach, or suggest the features of claim 6. In particular, **Matsuzawa** does not describe, teach, or suggest “a low-resistance layer is provided on said common electrode layer in a position parallel to a row of said piezoelectric elements” as set forth in claim 6, in combination with the other claimed features.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claim 6 should be withdrawn.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, claims 6-9, as amended, are believed to be in condition for allowance, which action, at an early date, is requested.

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/807,175
Reply to OA dated August 20, 2004

If, for any reason, it is felt that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, Applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS,
HANSON & BROOKS, LLP

Darren R. Crew DARREN R. CREW
REG. NO. 37,806
for William G. Kratz, Jr.
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 22,631

WGK/nrp
Atty. Docket No. 021248A
Suite 1000
1725 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 659-2930



23850

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

H:\HOME\NANCY\02\021248A\AMENDMENT